

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the Section 112, Second Paragraph, rejections of claims 2-5 set forth in the Office Action of May 5, 2004. The withdrawal of the remaining claim rejections set forth in the Final Office Action of October 25, 2005 is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Status of the claims

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are pending.

Claims 1-6 and 8-17 stand rejected.

Claim 1 and 12-14 have been amended.

No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments to the claims.

Specification

To facilitate examination, the specification has been amended by the addition of paragraphs [0004] to [0009] to the background section, constituting explanations of well known terms, IP address, domain name, etc., and paragraph [0015] to the summary section.

No new matter has been added as a result of the amendment to the specification.

Claim Rejections Under Section 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 12-14 for lacking a proper antecedent basis for several claim elements. Claim 1 has been amended to read “a business category” and the word “the” has been struck from claims 12-14 as it appeared before the phrase “one existing” in the final line of each claim.

Applicant respectfully solicits the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2-14 under Section 112, second paragraph.

Rejection of Independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,243,443 to Low et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,254 to Kelly.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is neither rendered obvious nor anticipated by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner. The present invention relates to a new network using a novel address system, the full digital code address, that can be used independent of the current Internet, which relies on IP addresses. In contrast, the references relied upon by the Examiner, Low et al. and Kelly relate specifically to the Internet, which is based on IP addresses, and so cannot anticipate or render obvious the present invention, as set forth below.

According to the layer structure defined in the specification, the order from the top layer (operator) to the bottom layer (network entity) is as follows: operator, linked number code, IP address, full digital code address (FDCA) and network entity. Accordingly, the full digital code address is lower than IP address layer and is the real address used in the network. The IP address layer is optional. As such, the IP address could be regarded as an interim variable in the network of the present invention, where the purpose of using the IP address is merely to utilize the resources of the current Internet. Furthermore, in the present invention, there is a one to one correspondence between the linked number code and the full digital number address. Thus, the conversion in the present invention means converting a linked number code to be an IP address and converting the IP address to be a full digital number address. The present invention represents an improvement occurring between the IP address layer and the network entity layer, while Kelly and Low et al. concern improvements between operator layer and IP address layer.

Low et al., as shown in Figs. 5 and 6, discloses allowing a public switched telephone network (PSTN) user to access content that is stored on a computer network, via the Internet, and

that is accessible using URIs (uniform resource indicators). (Col. 7, line 44 to col. 9, line 18).

Low et al. discloses preferred embodiments based on the accessing of resources provided on the WWW. For at least this reason, Low et al. cannot disclose or suggest the full digital code of the present invention which comprises “an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, which number is specified by the country or area; a telephone number, said telephone number comprising the IDDD code of the country where a computer user is located, the area code of the domestic DDD of the user’s area, and the telephone number of the user’s company or home; and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number specified by the country or area for uniformly demarcating a business category,” as recited in claim 1.

Kelly relates to “a method and apparatus which enables traditional telephone numbers formatted as domain names to be resolved into network protocol address.” (Col. 3, line 44-48). Kelly’s reliance on conventional domain names and subdomains, see Fig. 5, teaches away from the present invention, in which the FDCA is implemented below the IP layer between the IP layer and the network entity. As such, Kelly and Low in combination cannot disclose or suggest the full digital code of the present invention which comprises “an online number, said online number comprising the digital number of an established network site, which number is specified by the country or area; a telephone number, said telephone number comprising the IDDD code of the country where a computer user is located, the area code of the domestic DDD of the user’s area, and the telephone number of the user’s company or home; and a category number, the category number comprising the digital number specified by the country or area for uniformly demarcating a business category,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, the combination of Low et al. and Kelly can neither render obvious nor anticipate independent claim 1.


For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 8-17 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested. Applicant does not believe that any fee in addition that that enclosed for the one-month extension and a Request for Continued Examination is required in connection with the submission of this document. However, should any additional fee be required, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit or any overpayments made, to Deposit Account 02-4377.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By:


Jeffrey D. Sullivan
Patent Office Reg. No. 43,170

David Loretto
Patent Office Reg. No. 44,374

Attorneys for Applicant
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10012-4498
(212) 408-2500